



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,894	08/28/2003	Jason Robert McGee	RSW920030102US1	8718
46320	7590	07/30/2009	EXAMINER	
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP			BATES, KEVIN T	
STEVEN M. GREENBERG			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE				
SUITE 3020			2456	
BOCA RATON, FL 33487				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/30/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/650,894

Filing Date: August 28, 2003

Appellant(s): MCGEE ET AL.

---

Steven M. Greenberg  
Reg. No. 44,725  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 23, 2009 appealing from the Office action mailed January 23, 2009.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

No amendment after final has been filed.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6519594	Li	2-2003
2004/0255293	Spotswood	12-2004
6721777	Sharma	4-2004

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

**Claims 1-2, 4, 6-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (6519594) in view of Spotswood (2004/0255293).**

**Regarding claims 1, 11, and 19,** Li teaches a method of generating a logically merged web module for a web application, comprising:

Responsive to a determination that a shared module designation file exists, identifying at least one shared web module from the shared module designation file to be incorporated into a application to form at least one identified shared module (Col. 8, lines 10 – 21; Col. 8, lines 50-55; Col. 10, lines 26 - 31), wherein the shared designation file includes all descriptors that reference the at least one shared module (Col. 9, lines 16 – 32);

locating the at least one identified shared module using path information (Col. 8, line 67- Col. 9, line 4; Col. 9, lines 16-32); and

logically merging the at least one shared module with modules of the web application, in accordance with the shared module designation file to generate a logically merged web application (Col. 10, lines 26 – 49), wherein a reference to the at least one shared web module is used in the logically merged application rather than a copy of the at least one shared module (Col. 8, lines 22-26).

Li does not explicitly indicate that the applications and modules comprise web applications and its modules.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

**Regarding claims 2, 12, and 20,** Li teaches the method of claims 1, 11, and 19, further comprising: loading the logically merged application into a container (Col. 9, lines 5 – 15).

Li does not explicitly indicate a web application running on a web container.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62), where the applications are run using on a web container (¶76).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of

web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

**Regarding claim 4,** Li teaches the method of claim 1.

Li does not explicitly indicate wherein the web application is an enterprise archive (EAR) and wherein the logically merged web application is a logically merged EAR.

Spotswood teaches that web applications can be run using java virtual machine on a web server (¶56-62), indicate wherein the web application is an enterprise archive (EAR) and wherein the logically merged web application is a logically merged EAR (¶49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Spotswood's teaching of web applications and their use of web modules and java classes to expand Li's teaching of shared java classes to include web applications running in java virtual machine.

**Regarding claims 6 and 14,** Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with web modules of the web application includes: determining a priority associated with the at least one shared web module (Col. 9, lines 59 – 67); and resolving any conflicts between shared web modules in the at least one shared web module and conflicts between the at least one shared web module and web modules of the web application, if any (Col. 8, lines 10 – 21).

**Regarding claims 7 and 15,** Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein the steps of identifying, locating, and logically merging are performed during an

initialization process of a runtime environment for initializing the web application to be run on a server (Col. 8, lines 40 – 62).

**Regarding claim 8,** Li teaches the method of claim 1, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with the web modules of the web application includes using a service provider interface (SPI) that provides merge logic for merging different module types (Col. 8, lines 40 – 62).

**Regarding claims 9 and 17,** Li teaches the method of claims 2 and 12, wherein the container uses one or more application program interfaces (APIs) to identify a path to the at least one shared web module and loads the at least one shared web module when loading the logically merged web application (Col. 9, lines 5 – 9).

**Regarding claims 10 and 18,** Li teaches the method of claims 1 and 11, wherein logically merging the at least one shared web module with web modules of the web application includes at least one of re-linking references to the at least one shared web module in the web modules of the web application, extrapolating policy information for the at least one shared web module from a policy file associated with the web application, and modifying a class path for the web application to include paths to each of the at least one shared web modules (Col. 9, lines 16 – 31; lines 61 – 67).

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of Spotswood, and further in view of Sharma (6721777).**

**Regarding claim 5,** the combined teaching of Li and Spotswood disclose method of claim 1.

The combination does not explicitly indicate wherein the at least one shared web module includes at least one of a web archive (WAR) file, an enterprise java bean (EJB) archive file, and a resource archive (RAR) file.

Sharma teaches that in addition to the java classes that are shared between applications taught in Li, that web applications can also share resource adaptor modules (Col. 3, lines 13 – 15; lines 29-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these resource adapters in Li's shared memory space to ensure that memory usage gets saved by only running one resource adapter at a time and sharing it between applications.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

*Regarding claims 1, 11, and 19, the appellant argues that Li does not teach descriptors which reference at least one shared module. More particularly, the links presented in the name table of Li does not anticipate the reasonable interpretation of a descriptor. See Appellant's Brief pg 9-10.*

#### **The examiner disagrees:**

The appellant argues that a descriptor is typically characterized as a file which describes the contents or the functionality of another object. See Appellant's Brief pg 9-10. Descriptors are solely described in the specification on pg 19, line 11 through pg 20, line 14. It is clear from that disclosure of the descriptors is that they function more of

a way to identify and locate shared web modules which operate for a web application.

See Spec. pg 20, lines 4 – 10. The specification provides no indication that a descriptor is necessarily a file nor has anything to do with objects as the appellant has argued.

Li teaches a method of sharing java class among web applications operating on the same container. See Li, Col. 7, lines 31 – 41. Li teaches that multiple JVMs which each operate a plurality of classes and those classes can be identified through a name table if they are currently operating in the shared memory pool. See Col. 9, lines 25 - 31. Where when the class is initialized, it is created with a name and gets a path within the shared memory pool. See Li, Col. 10, lines 20 – 26. Finally, when the JVM needs to operate a certain class, it provides a call for that class in order to identify the existence of the classes within the shared memory. See Col. 10, lines 26 – 49. It is clear from Li, that the classes which are to be shared have the ability to be identified and found by the JVM which is attempting to run the class, and by any other JVM which attempts to share that class. As result, each application must be equipped with the proper descriptor or reference to the valid name of the class within the system and shared memory pool.

*Regarding claims 1, 11, and 19, the appellant argues that Li does not teach logically merging at least one shared web module. More specifically, that logically merging should be construed as merging objects in logic without creating a physically merged object, while Li only teaches "sharing an instantiation".*

**The examiner disagrees:**

The appellant's description of what logical merger consists of is in direct disagreement with the specification. The process of merging web modules to be shared is described in the specification on pg 13, line 21 though pg 14, line 29. The specification describes how applications and shared modules get merged is through the reuse of certain modules which two separate applications both use as part of their operation. Li teaches a system of operating a plurality of JVM applications and which have the ability to share common java classes among themselves. See Li, Col. 10, lines 26 - 49. As result, the sharing of classes in Li relates to the logical merger of classes which both JVMs both need to operate and allow them to both operate while only having one single copy of the needed java classes. See *id.* Thus Li teaches the limitation recited in the claim in light of the specification, rather than the dictionary definition the appellant is attempting to assert.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/KEVIN BATES/

Application/Control Number: 10/650,894  
Art Unit: 2456

Page 10

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456

Conferees:

/Aaron Strange/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2448

/John Follansbee/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451